

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, and 25 are independent.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-11 are allowed. For the reasons discussed below, Applicant believes that all of the pending claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Planas-Tezuka Rejection

Claims 12-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Planas (USP 6,112,015) in view of Tezuka (USP 6,018,769). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Planas is directed to a network management graphical user interface that permits a user to view a graphical depiction showing detailed state and status information for various network objects of a communications network. Network elements or objects are graphically represented with icons. Commonly occurring state and status combinations are represented by changing various attributes of the basic icons while less commonly occurring state and status combinations are graphically depicted by utilizing modified icons.

Significantly, the Planas invention gathers data concerning the network state and status from the network itself, not an

operator. More specifically and as discussed in column 4, lines 34-52, network management traffic containing state and status information for the network elements is sent to the management work stations 8 via data communications network 9. This is quite typical of modern telecommunications networks which include service channels or IP overlay networks that are used as pipelines to send state and status information to a network manager node.

This state and status information is commonly referred to in the industry as OAM&P (operation administration, maintenance and provisioning) information. Certain alarms are raised when network elements fail. For instance, when an optical fiber is damaged or a transmitter goes off-line then a loss of signal (LOS) state is automatically detected by receiver equipment. An alarm is typically sent to a network management terminal such as the one invented by Planas in order for a network operator to understand where the alarm has occurred such that corrective action may be taken such as dispatching a technician to the failed network element. It is emphasized that such state and status information is automatically gathered by the network and sent via appropriate communications channels to the network manager node.

As such, Planas is directed to an entirely different concept and is within an entirely field of use than the presently claimed invention. As detailed above, Planas is directed to a network management interface that permits a network manager operator to

surveil a communications network that is in operation. This is quite distinct from the manufacturing environment of the present invention in which the systems and methods of the invention are applied to manage defective module information.

Such defective module information is generated via various testing and measurement procedures that are conducted on modules that have just been manufactured. In other words, the present invention works in the manufacturing environment when manufactured modules are undergoing testing and verification procedures.

During the testing process, certain symptoms may be detected. The symptoms may then be logged in to the database via a graphical user interface. It is important to note that it is the user which logs these systems of a defect into the database. This is a feature that is certainly not disclosed or suggested by Planas.

More specifically and in terms of claim 12, Planas does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface including a symptoms information area that permits a user to log symptoms of a defect and corresponding module identification information to the database via the network. Again, it is the user that logs the systems of a defect (and corresponding module identification information) into the database via the graphical user interface and the network. In contrast, Planas automatically gathers alarm information from network elements that are failing or degraded and displays these

received alarms on a on a graphical user interface. This is a very distinct concept from the system of claim 12.

The Office Action also seems to confuse the network of Planas with the network of the invention. In Planas, the network of telecommunications nodes is the very thing being monitored via a graphical user interface. In the invention, however, the network is merely used to interconnect a plurality of work stations and the database such that the graphical user interface on these work stations may permit a user to log symptoms of a defect and corresponding module identification to the database via the network.

In terms of claim 25, Planas also does not disclose or suggest the method of managing defective module information recited therein. Specifically, Planas does not disclose or suggest generating a symptoms information area in a graphical user interface that permits a user to log symptoms of a defect and corresponding module identification information to the database via the network. Again, the defective module information and the symptoms logged in by the user relate to a manufacturing environment which is quite distinct from the telecommunications network monitoring and graphical user interface of Planas that displays network alarms raised in a live or operating network and which has no facility that permits a user to log symptoms of a defect.

Furthermore, Tezuka does not remedy any of the noted deficiencies of Planas. Indeed, Tezuka is merely applied to teach the features of certain dependent claims. Tezuka is also applied to teach a database as well as the plurality of work stations with these features being allegedly missing from Planas. However, a closer review of Planas will reveal that both a database and the plurality of work stations are indeed disclosed therein although in a manner much different than the present invention. Specifically, column 4, lines 21-25 refer to databases as being an additional component that may be connected to the network. Furthermore, the work stations 8 are mentioned in the plural and such work stations host the graphical user interface of Planas as further discussed in column 4, lines 33-36. Thus, it is not understood why Tezuka is applied at all.

Applicant further asserts that Tezuka certainly does not disclose or suggest any graphical interface that permits a user to log symptoms of a defect relating to a defective module that has been manufactured. In other words, Tezuka does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface including symptoms information area permitting a user to log symptoms of a defect and corresponding module identification information to the database via a network as recited in independent claim 12. Furthermore, Tezuka does not disclose or suggest a method of managing defective module information which includes a generating step that generates a

symptoms information area in a graphical user interface that permits a user to log symptoms of a defect and corresponding module identification information to the database via a network as further recited in independent claim 25.

Since neither Planas nor Tezuka disclose or suggest certain specific features of the rejected independent claims, the full combination of these patents also do not disclose or suggest these features. Furthermore, there appears to be no motivation for combining these two patents, particularly since Planas already discloses a database and plurality of work stations which appears to be the basis for combining these two patents.

For all of the above reasons, taken alone or in combination, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdraw of the Section 103 Planas-Tezuka rejection.

### Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael R. Cammarata (Reg. No. 39,491) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/kpc

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 02/12/2004)